

Appl. No. 10/604,875

Response to Office Action mailed on August 13, 2007

Date of Amendment: October 9, 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 and 19-49 stand rejected. Claim 18 had been previously cancelled. Claims 1, 29 and 30 have been amended herein. Therefore, claims 1-17 and 19-49 are pending and at issue.

As an initial matter, Applicant would like to point out that the present Amendment is being submitted after the Final Office Action. Additionally, Applicant is submitting herewith a Petition for a one month extension of time, a Request for Continued Examination and fee. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the present Amendment, reconsideration of the rejection of the claims and allowance of the case.

Claims 1, 4, 6-8, 12, 14-17, 21-23, 27, 29-31, 34-37, 41 and 44-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Browseraccelerator (Jan. 2002). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as the cited reference fails to disclose or suggest the features recited in independent claims 1, 29 and 30, from which all remaining claims depend.

Specifically, independent claim 1 is directed to a method of anticipating the trustworthiness of an internet site based upon predetermined criteria. Claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the subject matter. For example, claim 1 has been amended to recite that each of the criteria has a weighted point value, wherein at least one of the criteria has a different weighted point value from another of the criteria. Additionally, claim 1 has been amended to recite creating a trust score from the weighted point values of the criteria that the site complies with and creating an analytical result based on the trust score.

The cited reference simply fails to disclose or suggest such steps. The Office Action alleges that the cited reference creates an analytical result as an indicator of trustworthiness.

Appl. No. 10/604,875

Response to Office Action mailed on August 13, 2007

Date of Amendment: October 9, 2007

However, referring to the "7 distinct advantages," the cited reference does not create any sort of analytical result as recited in the present claims. More specifically, the cited reference simply lists facts concerning the requested internet site, including the site age, postal and mail addresses and the like. These facts do not have a point value, let alone a weighted point value wherein at least one of the criteria has a different point value from another of the criteria. Assuming *arguendo* that performing page ranking includes analysis of the number of hits, this criteria does not have a weighted point value as recited in the claims. This criteria would have a single value. Additionally, if other criteria were considered in Browseraccelerator, each of the criteria would have the same value and therefore, would not be weighted. For example, page ranking would simply sum the number of page hits and thus would not be weighted.

The present application, on the other hand, describes and claims various methods to create an analytical result, such as by assigning weighted point values to various criteria (which may include some of the facts listed in the cited reference) and compiling the total point value (trust score) to provide an analytical result which is used as an indicator of the trustworthiness of the internet site. This analytical result provides an accurate and immediate means to convey the trustworthiness to the internet user. Accordingly, the cited reference fails to disclose or suggest at least the step of creating an analytical result as recited in independent claim 1. Therefore, the rejections of claim 1 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claim 30 recites a similar step of creating an analytical result based on the criteria with which the internet site complies wherein the criteria have weighted point values. Therefore, for similar reasons to those presented above with respect to claim 1, the rejection of claim 30 should also be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Appl. No. 10/604,875

Response to Office Action mailed on August 13, 2007

Date of Amendment: October 9, 2007

Independent claim 29 recites a system also clarifying how an analytical result is created. Specifically, the system includes means for summing the weighted number point values for each criterion the internet site meets and a means to create the analytical result from the summed weighted number point values. The cited reference obviously fails to disclose or suggest means for summing the weighted number point values for each criterion the internet site meets as no weighted number point values are created for the criterion in the cited reference. As presented above, the cited reference merely lists facts relating to the website and thus does not sum any sort of number point values for the criterion. Therefore, for this additional reason, the rejections of independent claim 29 are improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 6-8, 12, 14-17, 21-23, 27, 31, 34-37, 41 and 44-49 depend from independent claims 1, 29 and 30. Therefore, for similar reasons to those presented above with respect to the independent claims, the rejection of the dependent claims should also be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5, 9-11, 13, 17, 20, 24-26, 28, 29, 32-34, 38-40, 42 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Browseraccelerator. These claims depend from independent claims 1, 29 and 30. For the same reasons as presented above, this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Therefore, Applicant submits that the amended claims are allowable over Browseraccelerator. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections of the claims and allowance of the case.

Appl. No. 10/604,875

Response to Office Action mailed on August 13, 2007

Date of Amendment: October 9, 2007

If any additional fees are due in connection with this application, the Patent Office is authorized to deduct the fees from Deposit Account No. 19-1351. If such withdrawal is made, please indicate the attorney docket number (35041-400300) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joseph H. Henton

PTO Reg. No. 53,019

Seyfarth Shaw LLP

Attorneys for Assignee

131 South Dearborn Street

Suite 2400

Chicago, Illinois 60603-5577

312-460-5000

312-460-7000 (fax)